

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/847,751	Applicant(s) TOWNSEND, VANWINKLE (VAN) T.	
	Examiner Shi K. Li	Art Unit 2613	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Shi K. Li.

(3) _____.

 (2) Jeff A. Holmen.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 October 2006
Time: 1:05 p.m.
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

20

Prior art documents discussed:

Sonderegger et al. (U.S. Patent 5,796,504)

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's arguments in the Appeal Brief is persuasive. However, prior art reference Sonderegger et al., which has been made of record but is not used in the Final rejection, reads on claim 20. The Examiner suggests to amend claim 20 so that it has similar limitations as the other independent claims, which are not taught by Sonderegger et al. We have agreed to amend claim 20 as documented in an Examiner Amendment that has the same paper no. of this interview summary.